

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Milton Joseph Taylor,	)	C/A No. 0:10-1147-HFF-PJG
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</b>
	)	
Warden John Owen; U.S. Parole Commission;	)	
and U.S. Attorney General,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
_____	)	

The petitioner, Milton Joseph Taylor (“Petitioner”), a self-represented federal prisoner, brought this action seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. On July 22, 2010, the respondents filed a motion to dismiss or in the alternative, for summary judgment. (ECF No. 9.) By order of this court filed July 23, 2010, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the petitioner was advised of the dismissal and summary judgment procedures and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. (ECF No. 10.)

On August 24, 2010, the petitioner filed a motion for an extension of time to respond to the respondents’ motion. (ECF No. 12.) The court granted the petitioner’s motion for extension in its docket text order dated August 30, 2010, giving the petitioner until September 27, 2010 to file a response to the respondents’ motion. (ECF No. 13.) The petitioner was specifically warned that if he failed to respond, this action would be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Despite this second warning, the petitioner still did not respond. Therefore, the petitioner meets all of the criteria for dismissal under Chandler Leasing Corp.v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919 (4th Cir. 1982).<sup>1</sup>

### RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution. See Davis, 558 F.2d at 70; Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93, 95 (4th Cir. 1989) (stating that magistrate judge's prior explicit warning that a recommendation of dismissal would result from the petitioner failing to obey his order was proper grounds for the district court to dismiss the suit when the petitioner did not comply despite the warning), cert. denied sub nom, Ballard v. Volunteers of America, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). In light of the court's recommendation, the court further recommends that any pending motions (ECF No. 9) be terminated.

  
Paige J. Gossett  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

October 1, 2010  
Columbia, South Carolina

*The parties' attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.*

---

<sup>1</sup>He is personally responsible for proceeding in a dilatory fashion, the respondents are suffering prejudice by continuing to have these claims clouding their careers and continuing to incur legal expenses, and no sanctions appear to exist other than dismissal given the previous warnings and extensions provided. Lopez, 669 F.2d at 920.

### **Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
901 Richland Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).